



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/284,735	04/19/1999	KOJI HANAOKA	445-272P	2726

2292 7590 01/15/2002
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

GUARIELLO, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1771	11

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/284735	Applicant(s)	Hanack et al.
Examiner	John Guarcello	Group Art Unit	1791

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/2/2001

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 20 - 28 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 20 - 28 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

15. The Examiner acknowledges paper # 10, the extension of time and the amendment of 11/2/2001.

16. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP-61-1108700 in view of Lohr et al. 4,347,151.

Art Unit: 1771

JP'700 describes a wiping cleaner (like a detergent impregnated article) which is an impregnated web (e.g. paper or unwoven cloth) with a detergent composition, (see abstract). JP'700 describes the detergent composition made of silicone oil, 0.1-10 wt.%, 30-89.6 wt.% water, vegetable gum for retaining water, surfactants among other components, (see abstract). JP'700 describes the wiping cleaner is effective for cleaning domestic or industrial goods and for protecting a cleaned surface, (see abstract). JP'700 differs from the claimed invention because it is silent about abrasive particles.

Lohr describes a cleaner polish composition with water, surfactant, (column 2, lines 10-46), and abrasive particles (column 2, lines 47-56), which are used for further facilitating the cleaning of surfaces by improving the removal of stubborn soils, like dirt, (column 2, lines 47-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the abrasive particles of Lohr in the wiping cleaner article of JP'700 motivated with the expectation that the abrasive particles would improve the removal of dirt from substrates as described by

Art Unit: 1771

Lohr. Regarding the method claims 20 and 28 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to clean a substrate with the claimed impregnated article since the steps are conventional in the cleaning art. Regarding the particle size of the abrasive particles and the amount of the detergent it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the size of the abrasive particles since dirt or soil removal would be improved by the appropriate selection of the size of the particles and the amount of the detergent used in combination with each other.

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action

Art Unit: 1771

and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

20. Rejections not maintained are withdrawn since the original claims were cancelled and new ground of rejection were applied. Applicant's arguments were considered but are not germane to the new grounds of rejection.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Guarriello whose telephone number is (703) 308-3209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4 pm.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

J
John J. Guarriello:gj

Patent Examiner

January 8, 2002

January 11, 2002

Terrel Morris
TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700